

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER CHARLES  
TILLISON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-CV-10196

v.

HON. MARK A. GOLDSMITH

EUELL, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

**(1) ACCEPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION DATED JANUARY 15, 2025 (Dkt. 24); (2) DISMISSING SUA SPONTE DEFENDANT WARDEN ADAM DOUGLAS; and (3) DENYING S MOOT DEFENDANT DOUGLAS' MOTION TO DISMISS OR FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AS MOOT (Dkt. 17)**

This matter is presently before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (R&R) of Magistrate Judge Grand, issued on January 15, 2025. In the R&R, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court sua sponte dismiss Defendant Warden Adam Douglas pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) for failure to state a claim and to deny as moot Defendant Douglas' motion to dismiss or for summary judgment. (Dkt. 17).

The parties have not filed objections to the R&R, and the time to do so has expired. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). The failure to file a timely objection to an R&R constitutes a waiver of the right to further judicial review. See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985) (“It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.”); Smith v. Detroit Fed’n of Teachers, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373-1374 (6th Cir. 1987) (failure to file objection to R&R “waived subsequent review of the matter”); Cephas v. Nash,

328 F.3d 98, 108 (2d Cir. 2003) (“As a rule, a party’s failure to object to any purported error or omission in a magistrate judge’s report waives further judicial review of the point.”); Lardie v. Birkett, 221 F. Supp. 2d 806, 807 (E.D. Mich. 2002) (“As to the parts of the report and recommendation to which no party has objected, the Court need not conduct a review by any standard.”). However, there is some authority that a district court is required to review the R&R for clear error. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 Advisory Committee Note Subdivision (b) (“When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

Therefore, the Court has reviewed the R&R for clear error. On the face of the record, the Court finds no clear error and accepts the recommendation.

Accordingly, the Court accepts the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 24). The Court sua sponte dismisses Defendant Warden Adam Douglas pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) for failure to state a claim. The Court denies as moot Defendant Douglas’ motion to dismiss or for summary judgment. (Dkt. 17).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 18, 2025  
Detroit, Michigan

s/Mark A. Goldsmith  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MARK A. GOLDSMITH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE